

Appln No. 09/640,479

Amdt date June 17, 2004

Reply to Office action of April 12, 2004

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-2 and 4-17 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 10, and 12 are amended.

Claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-15, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being obvious over Mera et al. 4,122,376 in view of Tatsuda et al. 4,972,116; and claims 7 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being obvious over Mera in view of Tatsuda, and further in view of Ge et al. 5,859,508. Applicant submits that all of the pending claims are patentable over the cited references, and reconsideration and allowance of these remaining claims are respectfully requested.

Independent claims 1, 10 and 12 include, among other limitations, "wherein the second negative potential [that is applied to the electron control means] is lower than the first negative potential [that is applied to the electron emissive means]." (Emphasis added).

Mera does not teach, nor does it suggest the above limitations. The Office action equates the diffusion electrode 28 of Mera to the electron control means of the present invention. However, this diffusion electrode 28 "is operated by a positive potential applied thereto and to the shield-electrode layer 26 with respect to the potential of the cathode 22, and diffuses the electron current flowing from the cathode 22 to each segment anode 18 thereby to form an electric field which can level the density of electrons." (Col. 5, lines, 14-20, emphasis added). In fact Mera emphasizes that the "electrification-preventing layers 24 and the shield layer 26 are provided with a positive bias potential with respect to the

Appln No. 09/640,479

Amdt date June 17, 2004

Reply to Office action of April 12, 2004

cathode potential, preferably with a bias potential between the anode potential and the average of the cathode and anode potentials. (Col. 5, lines 46-50, emphasis added).

In contrast, the presently claimed invention applies a (negative) second potential to the electron control means that is lower than the (negative) first potential applied to the electron emissive means.

Indeed, by applying a positive potential to the shield-electrode layer with respect to the potential of the cathode to diffuse the electron, Mera teaches away from the present invention in which a lower potential is applied to the electron control means to accelerate the electrons (i.e., a repulsive force towards the display).

Similarly, Tatsuda does not teach or suggest the above limitation required by independent claims 1, 10, and 12.

Consequently, none of the cited references, alone or in combination disclose or suggest the claimed invention. In short, independent claims 1, 10, and 12 define a novel and unobvious invention over the cited references. Claims 2, 4-9, 11, and 13-17 are dependent from their respective claims 1, 10, and 12 and therefore include all the limitations of their respective independent claims and additional limitations therein. Accordingly, these claims are also allowable over the cited references, as being dependent from allowable independent claims and for the additional limitations they include therein.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that this application is now in condition

Appln No. 09/640,479


Amdt date June 17, 2004

Reply to Office action of April 12, 2004

for allowance, and accordingly, reconsideration and allowance
are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By 

Raymond R. Tabandeh

Reg. No. 43,945

626/795-9900

RRT/clv

CLV PAS566523.1--06/17/04 9:34 AM